

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**Remarks -- claims**

JAN 17 2007

The number of claims has been reduced since none of the more obvious material included in claims 11-16 need be claimed. The first four original claims have been included into new claim 17 to further define the invention so that it defines better over the prior art.

None of the prior art includes exactly the same components and as such, it cannot be assembled in the same way. The mechanical components are not judged to be mechanical equivalents to the prior art nor are they obvious variants for those versed in the pertaining art.

**Remarks -- general**

There appears to be a stalemate going on and Applicant would very much like to resolve the issue.

A brief history of the prosecution will put things in perspective:

In response to Examiner's first Office Action dated 02/10/2006 in which Examiner had found Applicant's application to be made up of two species, Applicant traversed Examiner's Election/restrictions by stating that Fig. 2A and Fig. 2b were obvious variants not patentably distinct.

Examiner, In his 05/10/2006 Office Action, countered Applicant's reply by slapping him with a "not fully responsive reply to the prior Office Action" and had to pay an extension fee! In that

same Office Action, Examiner canceled the election/restriction of the 02/10/2006 Office Action, but unfortunately, it got worse:

With Applicant not having changed one word in his application, Examiner, claiming that "In light of applicant's arguments and a better understanding of the invention . . ." he felt confident he had understood the invention now stated that Applicant did not have 1 nor 2 nor 4 nor 8 but 11, yes, that's right ELEVEN species. Needless to say, that wasn't Applicant's intention when trying to explain the invention :-(

Seeing that this was going nowhere and in order not to receive yet another Office Action wherein Examiner would have now found that there were 256 species, Applicant, reluctantly, in his 05/30/2006 reply elected species I in the hopes of moving things along. To that, Examiner wrote, in his 06/16/2006 reply that "Because Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP S 818.03(a))"

Actually, Applicant thought he had traversed way back in his march 9<sup>th</sup> reply! Since this traverse non traverse, dropping the traverse, reinstating a new set of elections, coercing elections by invoking the entire MPEP catalog of rules and regulations can go on for quite a while, Applicant, again, under under § 1.143 disagrees with the requirement for restriction and requests reconsideration and withdrawal or modification of the requirement, the reasons having been stated in Office Action reply mailed March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006 giving the reasons therefor.

Furthermore, Applicant hereby states that he intends on traversing any and all previous, current and yet to come elections and restrictions using the arguments set forth in Office Action reply mailed March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2006 until Examiner finally accepts that there is only one species.

Applicant has submitted herein a new set of claims that are written so that they correct for indefiniteness, lack of clarity, lack of proper antecedence basis and so forth. Moreover, Applicant, pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j) requests the constructive assistance and pursuant to MPEP 706.03(d), suggestions of Examiner in drafting one or more claims or in making constructive suggestions in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very Respectfully,



Louis Abdo

Applicant pro se